

REMARKS

[1-2] Claim 3-13 were rejected under 35 USC 101, as lacking utility. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 states that the signal “strength” is converted to current, and does not state that the signal *itself* is converted to current. The subject matter of claim 3 is analogous to a common audio amplifier that inputs a voltage signal and outputs current to drive a loudspeaker. The Examiner is invited to note that “comprises” in line 3 of claim 3 permits an outside power source to be included in the claimed device.

Despite traversing the rejection, the Applicants have amended claim 3 to avoid any possible confusion. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The rejection of claims 9-11 and 13 is traversed on the basis that these claims do not recite the subject matter which the Examiner holds to be lacking utility. With respect, the rejection is improper as to these claims.

[3-4] Claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Peterzell in view of Durkota. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Peterzell is applied for disclosing transmitted power according to received signal strength, but it does not disclose any device indicating the transmitted signal strength.

(1) Durkota discloses a helicopter with a test antenna 102 (Fig. 1) coupled to a transceiver 107 (“XMTR/RCVR” in Fig. 2; col. 4, line 40). The power in the test antenna 102 is registered in a watt-meter 112, which reports the power to pulse code modulator 122, which is part of the onboard test system 105 (col. 4, lines 42-47). The system 105 includes its own antenna 154 (Figs. 1 and 2). The encoded power, and other data, are sent to this antenna 154 (Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 53-68) which transmits to an antenna 154 on the ground, which is part of a device 103 (col. 5, lines 1-4).

It is clear that the power in the transceiver antenna 102 is *not* indicated in the transceiver 107. Therefore, Durkota does not meet the claim language, "the second mobile system comprising ... an indicating device for ... indicating a transmitted RF power strength status of the transceiver *in the second mobile system*" (emphasis added).

Therefore, even if it were obvious to combine the references, the combination would not reach the instant claims.

(2) With respect, there was no reason to have combined the claims.

The Examiner states (third paragraph on page 3) that the person of ordinary skill would have combined the references for the purposes of providing a graphical display of antenna strength versus altitude and isotropy, but the Examiner has not established that Peterzell has any need of these features, or that these features are of such universal benefit that they should be added to every transceiver.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

(717) 426-1664

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax : (202) 408-0924

July 12, 2005
Date